1 2 3 4 5	James R. Condo (#005867) Amanda C. Sheridan (#027360) SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. One Arizona Center 400 E. Van Buren, Suite 1900 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2204 Telephone: (602) 382-6000 jcondo@swlaw.com asheridan@swlaw.com				
6	Richard B. North, Jr. (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)				
7	Georgia Bar No. 545599 Matthew B. Lerner (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)				
8	Georgia Bar No. 446986 NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH L.	LP			
9	Atlantic Station 201 17th Street, NW, Suite 1700				
10	Atlanta, GA 30363 Telephone: (404) 322-6000 richard.north@nelsonmullins.com				
11	matthew.lerner@nelsonmullins.com				
12	Attorneys for Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and				
13	Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc.				
14	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
15	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA				
16	IN RE: Bard IVC Filters Products Liability	No. 2:15-MD-02641-DGC			
17	Litigation	DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE IN			
18					
		OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO			
19		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S			
19 20		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS			
		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S			
20		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS (Assigned to the Honorable David G.			
20 21		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS (Assigned to the Honorable David G.			
202122		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS (Assigned to the Honorable David G.			
20212223		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS (Assigned to the Honorable David G.			
2021222324		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS (Assigned to the Honorable David G.			
202122232425		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS (Assigned to the Honorable David G.			
 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 		MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 7 TO EXCLUDE PRIOR JUDICIAL OPINIONS ON PLAINTIFF'S EXPERTS (Assigned to the Honorable David G.			

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. (collectively "Bard") submit this response in opposition to Plaintiff's Motion in Limine No. 7 and respectfully show the Court as follows:

ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY

Evidence is relevant when it has "any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence." Fed. R. Evid. 401(a). Relevant evidence may only be excluded "if its probative value is substantially outweighed" by the danger of prejudice. Fed. R. Evid. 403. The Plaintiff's Motion is premature and ignores these principles of law. Therefore, the Plaintiff's Motion should be denied.

Previous Rulings Could Become Relevant Based on Plaintiffs' Experts' Α. Testimony.

In Wilson v. Maricopa Cty., the Court was presented with an unusual situation in which the basis for the expert's previous exclusion was unclear. No. CV-04-2873 PHXDGC, 2007 WL 686726 (D. Ariz. Mar. 2, 2007). There was argument that "the disqualification occurred because of counsel's untimely disclosure, not because of [the expert's] lack of qualification." *Id.* at *11. And, the trial minutes discussing the specific basis for the expert's exclusion were not before the Court because they were illegible. *Id*. That would not be the case here, particularly given the comprehensive nature of some previous judicial opinions excluding the Plaintiff's expert witnesses.

In any event, Bard agrees that evidence of prior *Daubert* rulings will likely be irrelevant, and does not intend to introduce such evidence during voir dire or in opening statement. But, the relevancy of such evidence will depend entirely on the context and testimony of the evidence introduced by the Plaintiff. For example, if a the Plaintiff's expert testifies as to how many courts have qualified that expert, or otherwise suggests that his or her admission in other litigation means they are qualified to testify in this case, then prior exclusions may become relevant for cross-examination. A number of other situations may arise that make a complete prohibition on prior judicial opinions premature at this pretrial stage. As a result, the Plaintiff's Motion should be denied.

1 **CONCLUSION** 2 For these reasons, Bard respectfully requests that this Court deny Plaintiff's Motion 3 in Limine No. 7. 4 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 9th day of February, 2018. 5 s/ Richard B. North, Jr. Richard B. North, Jr. 6 Georgia Bar No. 545599 Matthew B. Lerner 7 Georgia Bar No. 446986 NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP 8 **Atlantic Station** 201 17th Street, NW / Suite 1700 9 Atlanta, GA 30363 PH: (404) 322-6000 10 FX: (404) 322-6050 richard.north@nelsonmullins.com 11 matthew.lerner@nelsonmullins.com 12 James R. Condo (#005867) Amanda Sheridan (#027360) 13 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. One Arizona Center 14 400 E. Van Buren Phoenix, AZ 85004-2204 15 PH: (602) 382-6000 jcondo@swlaw.com 16 asheridan@swlaw.com 17 Attorneys for Defendants C. R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 9th day of February, 2018, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will automatically send email notification of such filing to all attorneys of record.

s/Richard B. North, Jr. Richard B. North, Jr.

Mullins Riley & Scarborough	 201 17th Street NW, Suite 1700	Atlanta, GA 30363	(404) 322-6000
lson Mu			